

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,873	09/28/2001	Daniel Max Warren	328 P 623	4946
7:	590 07/25/2005		EXAMINER	
Anthony G Sitko			PENDLETON, BRIAN T	
Marshall Gerstein & Borun 6300 Sears Tower 233 South Wacker Drive			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Chicago, IL 60606-6357			2644	

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	T 2			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summany	. 09/966,873	WARREN ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Brian T. Pendleton	2644		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replif NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be oly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro te, cause the application to become ABANDOI	timely filed lays will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. & 133).		
Status				
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/1/	<u>′05</u> .			
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allows closed in accordance with the practice under	·			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1,2,12,13,15,16,24,</u> 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>3-11,14,17-23 and 26-29</u> is/are rejection is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	25,30 and 31 is/are withdrawn fro ted.	om consideration.		
Application Papers				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 September 2001 is Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objection is required if the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Sometion is required if the drawing(s) is continuous.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Application of the price of the p	ation No ved in this National Stage		
Attachment(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	. 4) 🔲 Interview Summa	ry (PTO-413)		
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date Patent Application (PTO-152)		

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 15, 16, 24, 25, 30, and 31 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 4/1/05. In addition, Applicant is correct to presume that claim 12 falls under group I and claim 13 falls under group Π .

Applicant's election with traverse of group III in the reply filed on 4/1/05 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that there is no serious burden to the Examiner to search the different groups because all groups need to be searched in order to properly examine the independent claims. This is not found persuasive because Examiner determines the extent of burden. It is the Examiner's contention that searching for the methods of determining the sensitivities of microphones and determining the arrangement of microphones in an array place an unreasonable burden on the Examiner while also having to search for the microphone array apparatus and its associated method. Furthermore, the fact that the groups fall into the same class does not preclude the fact that the search is still unreasonable.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 09/966,873

Art Unit: 2644

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 3, 4, 5, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ehrlich, US Patent 3,860,928. Ehrlich disclose a system in figure 16 comprising first, second and third microphones in array 202, amplifier 216G (means for converting the electrical signal of each of the microphones into a single multi-order directional signal), amplifier 216D (means for converting the electrical signal of two of the microphones into a signal first order directional signal), and amplifier 218B (means for summing the multi-order directional signal and the first order directional signal). As to claim 5, there exists a gate for turning on and off the microphone signals which reads on means for adjusting the relative gain of the first, second and third microphones.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 4, 7-11, 14, 17, 18, 21-23 and 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradley et al, US Patent 5,463,694 in view of Boone et al, US Patent 6,741,713. Bradley discloses a gradient directional microphone comprising microphones 101, 103, 105; gradient signal processors 201, 203, and 229 for producing a multi-order directional signal 131, and first-order directional signals 207 and 209, respectively. Bradley does not disclose means for summing the multi-order directional signal and the first order directional

Art Unit: 2644

signal. Boone discloses a directional hearing aid device comprising microphones m1, m2, and m3; gradient signal processors GP1 and GP2; low pass filter LF; high pass filter HF and adder S4, said adder acting as summing means for summing directional microphone signals. The directional microphone signals U1, U2 are both output and added. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Bradley to sum its multi-order directional signal 131 and first-order directional signal 208 for the purpose of creating a directional signal with a higher directivity than the directional signal 131. Claims 3, 4, 17, 18. Boone discloses a low pass filter and a high pass filter which are used to flatten the frequency response of the directional microphone. It was a well known fact in the art of directional microphones that first order microphones exhibited a better frequency response at lower frequencies than second order microphones and that the higher the order of the microphone, the better the frequency response at higher frequencies. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Bradley and Boone to have the first order microphone signal coupled to the low pass filter LF and the second order microphone signal coupled to the high pass filter for the purpose of flattening out the frequency response of the microphone system. Claims 7-9, 14, 21-23, and 26-29 are met. Regarding claims 10 and 11, Bradley discloses that the first-order directional signals are of cardioid patterns and could be of any other first order gradient patterns.

Claims 5, 6, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradley in view of Boone as applied to claims 3 and 17 above, and further in view of Zoels, US Patent 6,385,323. The combination of Bradley and Boone does not disclose means for adjusting the relative gain of the microphones. Zoels discloses a hearing aid with automatic microphone

Page 5

Art Unit: 2644

balancing. The object of the apparatus of Zoels was to eliminate the differences in sensitivity of the microphones in order to improve the directional response of the microphone. The apparatus comprises microphones 1a, 1b, variable amplifiers 2a, 2b, and analysis and control units 10 and 11. As taught in column 1 lines 20-22, in order to achieve a directional microphone characteristic, the microphones must have identical sensitivities. Variable amplifiers 2a and 2b are manipulated to ensure an equal response from the microphones. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Bradley and Boone to include the variable amplifiers, as taught by Zoels, for the purpose of improving the performance of the directional microphone. Claims 5 and 19 are met. As to claims 6 and 20, it was obvious to make the magnitudes from the microphones equal for the purpose of directive microphone circuits, otherwise the directional microphone would not function properly.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian T. Pendleton whose telephone number is (571) 272-7527. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian Chin can be reached on (571) 272-7848. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/966,873

Art Unit: 2644

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brian T. Pendleton Examiner

Page 6

Art Unit 2644

btp